

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

| LIBERTON MODELLE  | FILING DATE | TITOOTINA ARTO TATIOTATION | ATTORNEY DOCUMENO        | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR       | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/580,481  | 06/15/2007  | David M. Roush             | 2400.1140002             | 4205             |
| 48219 01/27/2011 PATIENT ADMINISTRATOR FMC CORPORATION 1735 MARKET STRIET |             |                            | EXAMINER                 |                  |
|   |             |                            | DAVIS, ZINNA NORTHINGTON |                  |
| PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103  |             |                            | ART UNIT                 | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                            | 1625                     |                  |
|   |             |                            |                          |                  |
|   |             |                            | NOTIFICATION DATE        | DELIVERY MODE    |
|   |             |                            | 01/27/2011               | ELECTRONIC       |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

barbara.cherry@fmc.com

## Office Action Summary

| Application No.         | Applicant(s) |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| 10/580,481              | ROUSH ET AL. |
| Examiner                | Art Unit     |
| Zinna Northington Davis | 1625         |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

| Period for Reply   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.138(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filler after SIX (6) MCNTHS from the mailing date of this corremaintation.  - Follute to reply which the set of extended point of the provision of the pro | ling date of this communication.<br>J.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecu-  | tion as to the merits is                           |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G  | 3. 213.  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |  |  |  |
| <u> </u>   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |  |  |  |
| 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.   |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) 1-13 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.   |  |  |  |  |
| ,  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Exam  | ner.   |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 C   | FR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected  |  |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action   | n or form PTO-152.                                 |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) of   | r (f).   |  |  |  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol><li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li></ol>  | )  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06) 5) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06) 5) Other:  | pproduioff   |  |  |  |

|    | i apei ivo(s)riviai         |
|----|-----------------------------|
| US | Patent and Trademark Office |
| PT | OL-326 (Rev. 08-06)         |

Application/Control Number: 10/580,481

Art Unit: 1625

## Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 1-13 are pending.

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

**Group I,** claim(s) 1-11, drawn to a chemical compound and an insecticidal composition using the compound of formula (I).

**Group II**, claim(s) 12 and 13, drawn to a method of controlling insects using the chemical compound of formula (I).

3. The inventions listed as Groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Inventions I-II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See claims 12 and 13.

4. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Art Unit: 1625

5. The application does not meet the requirement for Unity of Invention for the following reasons:

- a) the permissible combinations under Annex B, Part 1(e) are lacking and b) a common structure is not present under Annex B, Part 1(f) in which the utility is attributed. See the radicals as defined by formula I such as Ar, R, R<sup>5</sup>, U, V, W, X, a, b, c, d, and e.
- 6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-13 are generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above Application/Control Number: 10/580,481 Page 4

Art Unit: 1625

and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) The inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (b) The inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries):
- (c) The prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention: and
- (d) The inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.
- 9. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after

Application/Control Number: 10/580,481

Art Unit: 1625

the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

- 10. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 11. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

  Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

  All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product

Art Unit: 1625

claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

- 12. Due to the complexity of the restriction requirement, a written request is made.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zinna Northington Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0682.
- The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- 15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

[SIGNATURE BLOCK ON NEXT PAGE]

Application/Control Number: 10/580,481 Page 7

Art Unit: 1625

Zinna Northington Davis/

Zinna Northington Davis Primary Examiner Art Unit 1625

Znd 01.17.2011